

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

In re Application of AIS GMBH AACHEN  
INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS & ABIOMED  
EUROPE GMBH, Petitioners, For an Order  
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782 to Take  
Discovery for Use in Foreign Proceedings,  
Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil  
Procedure, of Respondent Thoratec, LLC

Case No. [5:16-mc-80094-HRL](#)

**ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION  
FOR DISCOVERY IN AID OF  
FOREIGN LITIGATION PURSUANT  
TO 28 U.S.C. § 1782**

Re: Dkt. No. 1

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782, AIS GmbH Aachen Innovative Solutions and Abiomed Europe GmbH (collectively, petitioners), move for leave to conduct discovery of Thoratec, LLC (Thoratec) in aid of patent litigation pending in Germany. Thoratec, the accused infringer in the German actions, protests that the petitioners did not meet-and-confer before submitting the present application. However, petitioners correctly note that § 1782 applications typically are brought on an ex parte basis, and that the discovery target will then be given adequate notice of any discovery and have the opportunity to either participate in the discovery or to move to quash it.

Upon consideration of the application and the supporting papers, the court finds that the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1782 are satisfied. Petitioners' application therefore is granted, and they may serve their subpoena for documents and testimony. To the extent there are any confidentiality concerns with respect to the requested discovery, this court finds that such concerns

1 would be sufficiently addressed by a protective order, such as the one proposed by petitioners.  
2 However, the court will give the parties an opportunity to meet-and-confer and encourages them to  
3 attempt to agree on the terms of such an order. Additionally, the instant order is without prejudice  
4 to Thoratec to seek to quash the subpoena; but, in the event any discovery disputes arise, the  
5 parties shall comply with the undersigned's Standing Order re Civil Discovery Disputes, which  
6 (among other things) requires the submission of a joint discovery letter brief, rather than a noticed  
7 motion.

8 SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: July 1, 2016

10  
11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 HOWARD R. LLOYD  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

5:16-mc-80094-HRL Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Andrew Radsch andrew.radsch@ropesgray.com, CourtAlert@RopesGray.com,  
drago.gregov@ropesgray.com, james.nowell@ropesgray.com

Rebecca Rose Carrizosa rebecca.carrizosa@ropesgray.com, a.j.peak@ropesgray.com,  
courtalert@ropesgray.com

Richard T. McCaulley , Jr Richard.McCaulley@ropesgray.com

Roger J. Chin roger.chin@lw.com, #sfdocket@lw.com

Terrence J.P. Kearney terry.kearney@lw.com